

Philosophy Department Annual Performance Review Policy and Procedures

Preamble: The criteria set forth in this document do not supersede the stated requirements for tenure and promotion, and the criteria for all full-time faculty members are consistent with the Faculty Handbook. If an inconsistency should be found, the Faculty Handbook will take precedence.

General Policy and Procedure: For purposes of annual Performance Review, every member of the Department of Philosophy shall submit to the department Personnel Committee, by a previously announced deadline, a self-evaluation form (in which he/she will make a case for consideration at one of the five performance levels described below), together with relevant documentation, in the form of a dossier. Performance Level recognition shall be assigned to each faculty member in three categories: teaching, scholarly and creative activity and professional service to the profession, university, and community.

The Committee: The personnel committee will consist of the tenured members of the Philosophy Department, minus the Department Head. In the event that a tenured faculty member is under Performance Review, he/she will recuse him-/herself from the Committee, for the duration of his/her review.

The Committee's deliberations and all candidate materials are confidential, beyond required reporting to the Department Head, Dean and relevant college and university committees.

The Self-Evaluation Form: Candidates for performance review will assign themselves a Performance Level score of 1-5, in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service, and will provide a narrative justifying each assignment. Materials supporting these Performance Level assignments should be gathered in the Dossier.

The Dossier: Dossiers should include the following:

1. Cover memo, with self-assessment in each of the three categories: teaching, research, and service.
2. A list of publications. (The committee may request copies of the actual papers, if it desires.)
3. A list of papers accepted for publication. (Same parenthetical as above)
4. A list of conference papers delivered. (Same)
5. A list of papers accepted for conferences. (Same)
6. A list of grant proposals accepted. (Same)
7. A list of grant proposals submitted. (Same)
8. Course syllabi.
9. Descriptions of new course development (Supporting materials may be requested at committee's discretion.)
10. Summaries of student evaluations. (Raw data may be requested at committee's discretion.)
11. Grade distribution data.
12. List of service-oriented activities, with relevant dates.

Committee Procedure: There will be an initial evaluation of the faculty-member's self-assessment and a vote as to whether the committee concurs. The verdict will be determined by a simple majority of the Committee. In those cases where the committee concurs with the self-

assessment, this will be reported in the manner described below. In the case that the committee does not concur with the candidate's self-assessment, the committee will deliberate, in order to determine what the candidate's Performance Level ratings should be. This also will be determined by a simple majority of the Committee.

Reporting: The Committee's Performance Level ratings will be reported, initially, to the candidate. The report will include the Performance Level ratings assigned in each of the three categories. Subsequently, the Committee's report will be forwarded to the Department Head, who will conduct his/her own evaluation of the candidate's dossier and apply the candidate's pre-selected weights, in order to arrive at an Overall Performance Level rating. In the case that the Department Head disagrees with the Committee's ratings, he/she will provide a narrative, explaining his/her ratings. The Department Head will then pass along the Overall Performance Level rating to the candidate and to the College Dean.

Further Procedures: For a description of the subsequent stages of the Performance Evaluation process and for information concerning appeals see the websites of the College of Humanities and Public Affairs (<http://www.missouristate.edu/chpa/>) and of the Office of the Provost (<http://www.missouristate.edu/provost/>).

To follow are descriptions of the Five Performance Levels and the criteria for accomplishing them, in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service:

Rating	Performance Level Name	Performance Level Description
5	Exceptional	Performance/results consistently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in most aspects of performance.
4	Commendable	Performance/results frequently exceed competent levels. A high degree of proficiency is shown in certain aspects of performance.
3	Competent	Performance/results are consistently at expected levels. Meets job requirements.
2	Development Needed	Some performance deficiencies exist. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and improvement is required.
1	Unsatisfactory	Performance is consistently below acceptable levels. Performance Improvement Plan is to be established and immediate improvement is required.

I. TEACHING

Level 3 (Competent Performance)

The following are expected of all faculty:

1. Satisfactory student perceptions of teaching performance. (It is generally expected that

faculty score, on average, no higher than a 2.0 on student evaluations.)

2. Satisfactory peer evaluation of teaching and course materials (syllabus, tests, handouts, etc).¹
3. Satisfactory advising and tutoring.
4. Assigned grades reflect a reasonable distribution along the grade-scale.

Level 4 (Commendable Performance)

Each of the following items will merit consideration at Level 4:

1. High student perception of teaching performance. (It is generally expected that faculty score, on average, no higher than a 1.75 on student evaluations.)
2. High peer evaluation of teaching and course materials (syllabus, tests, handouts, etc). (See note 1.)
3. Substantial improvement in a course involving content or methodology.
4. Non-remunerated teaching: e.g. teaching tutorials or independent studies.
5. Receipt of a small off-campus grant or foundation support for teaching or course/curriculum/program development.
6. Submission of application for a major grant for teaching or course/curriculum/program development that is not funded.

Level 5 (Exceptional performance)

Each of the following items will merit consideration at Level 5:

1. Very high student perception of teaching performance. (It is generally expected that faculty score, on average, no higher than a 1.5 on student evaluations.)
2. Very high peer evaluation of teaching and materials (syllabus, tests, handouts, etc). (See note 1.)
3. Major award for teaching excellence.

¹ Peer evaluation of teaching will include the following considerations: (a) Is the content of the course scholarly and up to date? (b) Are the subjects treated comprehensively and in-depth? (c) Are the courses well organized? (d) Does the instructor use teaching methods, which are suitable to course objectives and which enhance learning? (e) Are the examinations and other graded assignments carefully designed, and do they provide a fair assessment of student learning? (f) Are the courses intellectually demanding, but appropriate to the course level? (g) Is grade distribution satisfactory?

4. Development of new course or program.
5. Receipt of a major external grant or funding for teaching or course/curriculum/program development.

II. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Level 3 (Competent Performance)

All faculty are expected to attend at least one professional academic meeting annually. Each of the following items will merit consideration at Level 3.

1. Evidence demonstrating research activities in progress.
2. Presentations at local or regional professional meetings or on campus.
3. Completion of sabbatical leave, including submission to department of a report on the leave.
4. Receipt of an MSU faculty research grant.
5. Acceptance for publication of a short note in a refereed publication.
6. Panelist at a professional meeting.
7. Commentator at a professional meeting.
8. Referee for disciplinary publication or funding agency.
9. Publishing a book review in a scholarly publication.

Level 4 (Commendable Performance)

Each of the following items will merit consideration at Level 4.

1. Acceptance for publication of a substantial note in a refereed, disciplinary/scholarly publication.
2. Refereed paper presented at a national or international professional conference.
3. Official acceptance for publication of a scholarly article, in a refereed professional journal or in refereed proceedings of a conference.
4. Receipt of a prize or award for publication from a state or national institution or agency.
5. Invited panelist at a major professional meeting.
6. Receipt of a small off-campus grant or foundation support.

7. Submission of application for a major grant, not funded.

Level 5 (Exceptional Performance)

Each of the following items will merit consideration at Level 5.

1. Official acceptance for publication of a scholarly book, by a recognized academic press.²
2. Official acceptance for publication of two or more scholarly articles, in refereed professional journals or in refereed proceedings of conferences.
3. Receipt of a major external grant or funding for research.
4. Receipt of a major award for research or scholarly activity.
5. Editor of a scholarly anthology, with individual contribution, by a recognized academic press.
6. Official acceptance for publication of a chapter, in an edited work, published by a recognized academic press.
7. Official acceptance for publication of an original textbook.

III. SERVICE

Level 3 (Competent Performance)

Each of the following items will merit consideration at Level 3.

1. Satisfactory service on departmental, college, or university committees.
2. Serving as an advisor to a university student organization.
3. Making a presentation to a community organization.
4. Active professional participation in a campus or community organization or institution.
5. Active participation with media in one's area of expertise, including acceptance for publication of an article or book review in the local newspaper.
6. Coordination of workshops, contests, or other university or departmental programs.

² Depending on factors such as quality, level of peer review, and disciplinary contribution, books/monographs can be evaluated for 2-4 years. The department committee makes this determination, with approval by the department head and dean.

Level 4 (Commendable Performance)

Each of the following will merit consideration at Level 4.

1. Active member of major university committee or college council.
2. Making a significant contribution in a professional capacity, to a community, state, or regional institution or event.
3. Making a significant contribution to a national professional academic institution or event.
4. Chairing an extra-departmental committee within the university.
5. Documented, non-remunerated professional consulting activities.
6. Editor of conference proceedings or other non-refereed work.

Level 5 (Exceptional Performance)

Each of the following will merit consideration at Level 5.

1. Serving as a major officer in a national or state professional (disciplinary) organization.
2. Serving as a faculty-senate officer.
3. Serving as Chair of any major university committee.
4. Editor of a recognized, professional (disciplinary) journal.